

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in connection with the interview held with the Examiner of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

The Examiner's highly beneficial cooperation during the interview has been gratefully acknowledged.

It was determined that additional changes to the claims and additional clarification of the invention would be necessary. In connection with this, applicant has amended claims 21 and 22, the broadest claims on file, and wish to make the following remarks.

It is believed to be advisable first of all to explain the differences between "poses" and "positions". In the context of the present application, the term "position" means a place on which the robot (the multi-axes processing device) is situated at a certain time point. On the one hand, that place could be the working place (shown in Figure 2 left position of the robot), and on the other hand it could be the non-working or calibrating place (right position of the robot in Figure 2). Therefore, the robot arrangement in accordance with the present invention deals with two different positions, namely a working position, and a non-working or calibrating position.

Contrary to the "position" the term "pose" means the concrete "figure" which the robot makes as a whole either in the working position or in the calibrating position. Accordingly, the "figure" of the robot as defined by the inclination or the twisting position of the different axes/segments 3, 4, 5 and/or the measuring system 16 and/or the work unit 15.

The main aspect of the present invention is that the calibration plate 22 is positioned in the non-working area in the same manner as in the work regions 17-20 in the working area. "In the same manner" means that all, the calibration plate and the work regions, have the same alignment in the space/room. Such an arrangement of the calibration plate in the work region enables that the work robot has the same pose during the working and calibrating procedure.

In the prior art, bearing and position tolerances were affecting position tolerances of the work robot, because in both positions the robot pose differs. To the contrary, in the present invention the problem does not exist because in the working position as well as in the calibrating position the robot works in the same pose.

The Red reference applied by the Examiner discloses among others in claim 1 that a robot works in a first and a second pose, one of it is the calibrating pose and the other one is the operating pose. However, at no

place it is described that the calibrating and the working areas have the same alignment in the space/room or the same poses.

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended correspondingly. It is believed that claims 21 and 22 as amended, in light of the above presented explanations, clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the prior art applied by the Examiner.

These claims should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.


As for the dependent claims, they depend on corresponding independent claims, they share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue.

Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233